



IN THE

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#6/Ald
Special - Accel.
Examination
7-10-01

APPLICANTS: David Banks, Kumar Malavalli, Paul Ramsay, Kha Sin Teow, and Jieming Zhu

SERIAL NO.: 09/426,567

FILING DATE: October 22, 1999

TITLE: A Method and System for Creating and Implementing Zones Within a Fibre Channel System

EXAMINER: not yet known

GROUP ART UNIT: 2731

ATTY. DKT. NO.: 3676

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner For Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date printed below:

Dated: April 18, 2000

By: *Renee DuBord*

Renee M. DuBord, Reg. No.: 42,500

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

ATTENTION: Group Director, Group 2731

PETITION TO MAKE SPECIAL FOR NEW APPLICATION

UNDER MPEP §708.02, VIII

1. Petition

Applicant hereby petitions to make this new application, which has not received any examination by the Examiner, special.

04/26/2000 MSNIFERA 00000028 09426567

01 FC:122

130.00 OP

2. Claims

All claims in this case are directed to a single invention.

If the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, Applicant will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status.

3. Search

A search has been made by professional searching company Woolcott & Company, in the following areas: class 709, subclasses 225 and 226; and class 370, subclasses 218, 222 and 360.

U.S. Examiner Swann was consulted with respect to the field of search.

4. Copy of References

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR §§ 1.56 and 1.97-98, enclosed herewith is modified form PTO-1449 listing references for consideration by the Examiner. A copy is enclosed herewith of each listed reference which may be material to the examination of this application, and with respect to which there may be a duty to disclose.

The filing of these references shall not be construed as a representation regarding the completeness of the list of references, or that inclusion of a reference in this list is an admission that it is prior art or is pertinent to this application, or as an admission that the information listed is, or may be considered to be, material to patentability, or that no other material information exists, and shall not be construed as an admission against interest in any manner.

The following US patents were revealed by the search:

- U.S. Pat. No. 5,442,791, “Integrated Remote Execution System for a Heterogenous Computer Network Environment”, by Wrabetz et al. (1995) (“**Wrabetz**”) (Ref. A)
- U.S. Pat. No. 5,519,695, “Switch Element for Fiber Channel Networks”, by Purohit et al. (1996) (“**Purohit**”) (Ref. B)
- U.S. Pat. No. 5,751,715, “Accelerator Fiber Channel Hub and Protocol”, by Chan et

- al. (1998) (“**Chan**”) (Ref. C)
- U.S. Pat. No. 5,752,003, “Architecture for Managing Traffic in a Virtual Lan Environment”, by Hart (1998) (“**Hart**”) (Ref. D)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,774,656, “Information Processing System and Method and Service Supplying Method for Use Within a Network”, by Hattori et al. (1998) (“**Hattori**”) (Ref. E)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,844,887, “ATM Switching Fabric”, by Oren et al. (1998) (“**Oren**”) (Ref. F)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,822, “Method and Apparatus for Memory Sequencing”, by Bennett (1999) (“**Bennett**”) (Ref. G)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,894,481, “Fiber Channel Switch Employing Distributed Queuing”, by Book (1999) (“**Book**”) (Ref. H)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,938,732, “Load Balancing and Failover of Network Services”, by Lim et al. (1999) (“**Lim**”) (Ref. I)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,944,798, “System and Method for Arbitrated Loop Recovery”, by McCarty et al. (1999) (“**McCarty**”) (Ref. J)
 - U.S. Pat. No. 5,968,126, “User-Based Binding of Network Stations to Broadcast Domains”, by Ekstrom et al. (1999) (“**Ekstrom**”) (Ref. K)

The following industry standards have been included in the IDS:

- Fibre Channel Physical and Signaling Interface (FC-PH), Rev. 4.3, working draft proposed American National Standard for Information Systems, June 1, 1994 (“**Ref. L**”)
- Fibre Channel Switch Fabric (FC-SW), Rev. 3.3, NCITS working draft proposed American National Standard for Information Technology, Oct. 21, 1997 (“**Ref. M**”)
- Fibre Channel Fabric Generic Requirements (FC-FG), Rev. 3.5, working draft proposed American National Standard for Information Systems, Aug. 7, 1996 (“**Ref. N**”)
- Fibre Channel Fabric Loop Attachment (FC-FLA), Rev. 2.7, NCITS working draft proposed Technical Report, Aug. 12, 1997 (“**Ref. O**”)
- Fibre Channel Generic Services – 2 (FC-GS-2), Rev. 5.3, NCITS working draft proposed American National Standard for Information Technology, Nov. 25, 1998 (“**Ref. P**”)

5. Detailed Discussion of the References

The following is a detailed discussion of the claims in the above-identified patent application and the references that particularly points out how the claimed subject matter is distinguishable over the references pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.111 (b) and (c). We have categorized

the references as follows:

Hart and Ekstrom:

Independent claim 1 of the present invention recites:

1. In a system comprising a first fabric and a plurality of devices coupled to the first fabric by fibre channel connections, a method for logically organizing the devices comprising:
accessing a definition of a first configuration including at least one zone, each zone including at least one device as a member of the zone; and
responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.

Both Hart and Ekstrom fail to teach claim 1. For example, neither Hart nor Ekstrom are concerned with a fabric using “fibre channel connections.” Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Hart and Ekstrom. Further, claims 2-26 incorporate the elements of claim 1, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 2-26 also are patentably distinguishable over Hart and Ekstrom for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 27 of the present invention recites:

27. A fabric element for use in a system comprising a first fabric and a plurality of devices coupled to the first fabric by fibre channel connections, the fabric element comprising:
a plurality of ports, each port adapted to be coupled to a device by a fibre channel connection;
a storage medium for storing a definition of a first configuration including at least one zone, each zone including at least one device as a member of the zone; and
a logic device coupled to the plurality of ports and to the storage medium, for, responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications for devices coupled to the plurality of ports.

Both Hart and Ekstrom fail to teach claim 27. For example, neither Hart nor Ekstrom are concerned with a fabric using “fibre channel connections.” Accordingly, claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over Hart and Ekstrom. Further, claims 28-32 incorporate the elements of claim 27, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 28-32 also are patentably distinguishable

over Hart and Ekstrom for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 33 of the present invention recites:

33. A computer readable medium containing software for logically organizing a plurality of devices coupled to a first fabric by fibre channel connections, the software for instructing a processor to perform the steps of:
accessing a definition of a first configuration including at least one zone, each zone including at least one device as a member of the zone; and
responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.

Both Hart and Ekstrom fail to teach claim 33. For example, neither Hart nor Ekstrom are concerned with a computer readable using “fibre channel connections.” Accordingly, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable over Hart and Ekstrom. Further, claims 34-46 incorporate the elements of claim 33, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 34-46 also are patentably distinguishable over Hart and Ekstrom for at least the reasons discussed above.

Wrabetz, Hattori and Lim:

Wrabetz, Hattori and Lim each fail to teach claims 1-46. For example, each of the three references fails to teach the claimed element of claim 1, “responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.” Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over these three references. Further, claims 2-26 incorporate the elements of claim 1, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 2-26 also are patentably distinguishable over these three references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Also, Wrabetz, Hattori and Lim each fail to teach the claimed element of claim 27, “a logic device coupled to the plurality of ports and to the storage medium, for, responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications for devices coupled to the plurality of ports.” Accordingly, claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over these three

references. Further, claims 28-32 incorporate the elements of claim 27, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 28-32 also are patentably distinguishable over these three references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Additionally, Wrabetz, Hattori and Lim each fail to teach the claimed element of claim 33, “responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.” Accordingly, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable over these three references. Further, claims 34-46 incorporate the elements of claim 33, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 34-46 also are patentably distinguishable over these three references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Purohit, Chan, Oren, Bennett, Book and McCarty:

Purohit, Chan, Oren, Bennett, Book and McCarty each fail to teach claims 1-46. None of these six references is concerned with the zoning of devices. For example, each of the six references fails to teach the claimed element of claim 1, “responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.” Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over these six references. Further, claims 2-26 incorporate the elements of claim 1, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 2-26 also are patentably distinguishable over these six references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Also, Purohit, Chan, Oren, Bennett, Book and McCarty each fail to teach the claimed element of claim 27, “a logic device coupled to the plurality of ports and to the storage medium, for, responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications for devices coupled to the plurality of ports.” Accordingly, claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over these six references. Further, claims 28-32 incorporate the elements of claim 27, and include

additional elements. Therefore, claims 28-32 also are patentably distinguishable over these six references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Additionally, Purohit, Chan, Oren, Bennett, Book and McCarty each fail to teach the claimed element of claim 33, “responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.” Accordingly, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable over these six references. Further, claims 34-46 incorporate the elements of claim 33, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 34-46 also are patentably distinguishable over these six references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Ref. L, M, N, O, P:

References L, M, N, O and P disclose Fibre Channel standards. References L, M, N, O and P each fail to teach claims 1-46. None of these five references is concerned with the zoning of devices. For example, each of the five references fails to teach the claimed element of claim 1, “responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric.” Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over these five references. Further, claims 2-26 incorporate the elements of claim 1, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 2-26 also are patentably distinguishable over these five references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Also, References L, M, N, O and P each fail to teach the claimed element of claim 27, “a logic device coupled to the plurality of ports and to the storage medium, for, responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications for devices coupled to the plurality of ports.” Accordingly, claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over these five references. Further, claims 28-32 incorporate the elements of claim 27, and include additional

elements. Therefore, claims 28-32 also are patentably distinguishable over these five references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Additionally, References L, M, N, O and P each fail to teach the claimed element of claim 33, "responsive to the definition of the first configuration, restricting communications between the devices coupled to the first fabric." Accordingly, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable over these five references. Further, claims 34-46 incorporate the elements of claim 33, and include additional elements. Therefore, claims 34-46 also are patentably distinguishable over these five references for at least the reasons discussed above.

6. Fee

The fee required by 37 CFR §1.17(i) is to be paid by the attached check for \$130.00.

Applicants respectfully submit that the criteria specified by MPEP §708.02 VIII has been met, and request that the petition to make the above-mentioned application special be granted.

Respectfully submitted,
David Banks, Kumar Malavalli, Paul Ramsay, Kha
Sin Teow, and Jieming Zhu

By: Renee DuBord
Renee M. DuBord, Esq.
Registration No. 42,500
Fenwick & West LLP
Two Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(650) 858-7880 (Phone)
(650) 494-1417 (Fax)